



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Adress: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

| | | | | |
|---|---------------|----------------------|---------------------|------------------|
| APPLICATION NO. | FILING DATE | FIRST NAMED INVENTOR | ATTORNEY DOCKET NO. | CONFIRMATION NO. |
| 10/800,670 | 03/16/2004 | Paul Vincent | Q80358 | 3012 |
| 23373 | 7590 | 03/23/2009 | EXAMINER | |
| SUGHRUE MION, PLLC 2100 PENNSYLVANIA AVENUE, N.W. SUITE 800 WASHINGTON, DC 20037 | | | NALVEN, ANDREW L | |
| ART UNIT | PAPER NUMBER | | 2434 | |
| MAIL DATE | DELIVERY MODE | | | |
| 03/23/2009 | PAPER | | | |

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

**Advisory Action
Before the Filing of an Appeal Brief**

| | | |
|------------------------|---------------------|--|
| Application No. | Applicant(s) | |
| 10/800,670 | VINCENT ET AL. | |
| Examiner | Art Unit | |
| ANDREW L. NALVEN | 2434 | |

—The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address —

THE REPLY FILED 12 March 2009 FAILS TO PLACE THIS APPLICATION IN CONDITION FOR ALLOWANCE.

1. The reply was filed after a final rejection, but prior to or on the same day as filing a Notice of Appeal. To avoid abandonment of this application, applicant must timely file one of the following replies: (1) an amendment, affidavit, or other evidence, which places the application in condition for allowance; (2) a Notice of Appeal (with appeal fee) in compliance with 37 CFR 41.31; or (3) a Request for Continued Examination (RCE) in compliance with 37 CFR 1.114. The reply must be filed within one of the following time periods:

a) The period for reply expires 3 months from the mailing date of the final rejection.
 b) The period for reply expires on: (1) the mailing date of this Advisory Action, or (2) the date set forth in the final rejection, whichever is later. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of the final rejection.
 Examiner Note: If box 1 is checked, check either box (a) or (b). ONLY CHECK BOX (b) WHEN THE FIRST REPLY WAS FILED WITHIN TWO MONTHS OF THE FINAL REJECTION. See MPEP 706.07(f).

Extensions of time may be obtained under 37 CFR 1.136(a). The date on which the petition under 37 CFR 1.136(a) and the appropriate extension fee have been filed is the date for purposes of determining the period of extension and the corresponding amount of the fee. The appropriate extension fee under 37 CFR 1.17(a) is calculated from: (1) the expiration date of the shortened statutory period for reply originally set in the final Office action; or (2) as set forth in (b) above, if checked. Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of the final rejection, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

NOTICE OF APPEAL

2. The Notice of Appeal was filed on _____. A brief in compliance with 37 CFR 41.37 must be filed within two months of the date of filing the Notice of Appeal (37 CFR 41.37(a)), or any extension thereof (37 CFR 41.37(e)), to avoid dismissal of the appeal. Since a Notice of Appeal has been filed, any reply must be filed within the time period set forth in 37 CFR 41.37(a).

AMENDMENTS

3. The proposed amendment(s) filed after a final rejection, but prior to the date of filing a brief, will not be entered because
 (a) They raise new issues that would require further consideration and/or search (see NOTE below);
 (b) They raise the issue of new matter (see NOTE below);
 (c) They are not deemed to place the application in better form for appeal by materially reducing or simplifying the issues for appeal; and/or
 (d) They present additional claims without canceling a corresponding number of finally rejected claims.

NOTE: _____. (See 37 CFR 1.116 and 41.33(a)).

4. The amendments are not in compliance with 37 CFR 1.121. See attached Notice of Non-Compliant Amendment (PTOL-324).

5. Applicant's reply has overcome the following rejection(s): _____.

6. Newly proposed or amended claim(s) _____ would be allowable if submitted in a separate, timely filed amendment canceling the non-allowable claim(s).

7. For purposes of appeal, the proposed amendment(s): a) will not be entered, or b) will be entered and an explanation of how the new or amended claims would be rejected is provided below or appended.

The status of the claim(s) is (or will be) as follows:

Claim(s) allowed: _____

Claim(s) objected to: _____

Claim(s) rejected: _____

Claim(s) withdrawn from consideration: _____

AFFIDAVIT OR OTHER EVIDENCE

8. The affidavit or other evidence filed after a final action, but before or on the date of filing a Notice of Appeal will not be entered because applicant failed to provide a showing of good and sufficient reasons why the affidavit or other evidence is necessary and was not earlier presented. See 37 CFR 1.116(e).

9. The affidavit or other evidence filed after the date of filing a Notice of Appeal, but prior to the date of filing a brief, will not be entered because the affidavit or other evidence failed to overcome all rejections under appeal and/or appellant fail to provide a showing a good and sufficient reasons why it is necessary and was not earlier presented. See 37 CFR 41.33(d)(1).

10. The affidavit or other evidence is entered. An explanation of the status of the claims after entry is below or attached.

REQUEST FOR RECONSIDERATION/OTHER

11. The request for reconsideration has been considered but does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because:
See Continuation Sheet

12. Note the attached Information Disclosure Statement(s). (PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s). _____

13. Other: _____

/Andrew L. Nalven/
Primary Examiner, Art Unit 2434

Continuation of 11. does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because: Applicant's arguments are not persuasive. Regarding the rejections under 35 USC 101, Applicant's arguments are not persuasive because the cited claims do not meet the first part of the machine or transformation test. A multimedia message service center and a relay server are interpretable as purely software and thus the machine test has not been met. Further, as previously noted, the claims do not present any method claim steps. The only limitation that could be interpreted as a step is the preamble which sets forth the environment of the invention by stating "A multimedia message service wherein a message is sent in a multimedia message service environment." This preamble statement merely recites the intended environment of the claim. The remaining claim limitations only provide for a message and define a stamp upon a message without providing for any steps or acts that modify or utilize the message.

Regarding the prior art rejections of claims 1-5, Applicant's arguments are not persuasive because Applicant has not shown that the combination of references fails to teach a multimedia message service, a multimedia message service center, or a multimedia message service message. Contrary to Applicant's assertion on page 5, Examiner has not acknowledged that Kuzma does not teach a multimedia message. Examiner clearly and explicitly stated that Kuzma teaches a multimedia message service center wherein said electronic stamp is an element associated with paying for sending the message and includes a value of the stamp (Kuzma, column 4 lines 35-45, column 5 lines 57-65. Kuzma teaches these limitations by disclosing an electronic post office that verifies the validity of an electronic stamp on a message. Kuzma's only deficiency is a failure to teach a "Multimedia Messaging Service." This deficiency only exists if one interprets the claimed "Multimedia Messaging Service" as a particular type of service instead of a generic multimedia message service. Due to the capitalization of this particular limitation and for purposes of expedited prosecution, Examiner provided the MTN reference to teach a Multimedia Messaging Service. Thus, the combinatino of Kuzma and MTN teach all of the claimed limitations.